



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,390	05/21/2001	Andrew D. Padawer	50037.26US1	8902
27488	7590	01/13/2006	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			PESIN, BORIS M	
P.O. BOX 2903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			2174	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/862,390

Applicant(s)

PADAWER ET AL.

Examiner

Boris Pesin

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6,7,11,12,15,17,21,22,26,27 and 31-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6,7,11,12,15,17,21,22,26,27 and 31-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 10/14/2005.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27 and 31-33 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 21 and 31-33 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 10/14/2005, Claims 1, 11, 21 and 31-33 were amended. This action is made Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27 and 31-33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roeder (US 5491745) in view of Kalish (US 6842612).

In regards to claim 1, Roeder teaches a method for providing shortcuts in a mobile electronic device, the method comprising: providing a shortcut data store configurable to contain shortcuts to a plurality of targets (Column 2, Lines 11-15); monitoring user input to the mobile electronic device from a first application (Column 2, Lines 11-15); determining whether the user input is a shortcut input, wherein the shortcut input comprises a tag that corresponds to a target associated with a second application in the shortcut data store (Column 3, Lines 56-63); if the user input is a shortcut input, locating the target that corresponds to the tag in the shortcut data store; and executing the second application to access the located target (Column 3, Lines 56-63). Roeder does not specifically teach that the shortcut data store comprises more than one type of target. Kalish teaches, "According to the present invention, the user can connect the internet using the URL dialup utility by dialing specific code numbers in the same manner he dials any conventional phone number. Each of the URL codes comprises a prefix code for indicating that this code is not a regular phone number but an URL code." (Column 3, Line 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Roeder with the teachings of Kalish and include a system for having a plurality of different target types with the motivation to provide the user a simpler method of accessing different information.

In regards to claim 2, Roeder and Kalish teach all the limitations of claim 1. Roeder and Kalish further teaches a method wherein the types of targets include at least one selected from a group comprising: telephone numbers, email address, uniform

Art Unit: 2174

resource locator (URL), and contact cards (The combination of Roeder and Kalish allows you to make phone calls(Roeder) and go to certain web pages (Kalish)).

In regards to claim 6, Roeder and Kalish teach all the limitations of claim 1. Roeder and Kalish further teaches a method wherein the shortcut input comprises more than one type (Roeder, column 1, lines 44-52).

In regards to claim 7, Roeder and Kalish teach all the limitations of claim 6. Roeder and Kalish further teaches a method wherein the types of shortcut input include at least one selected from a group comprising: a speed dial input, a voice input, a menu item selection input, and an icon selection input (Roeder, (Column 2, Lines 11-15).

KK Claims 11, 12, ¹⁵16, and 17 are similar in scope to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 21, 22, 26, and 27 are similar in scope to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 31-33 are similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27 and 31-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2174